THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

PHILIP W. BUCHEN
VICTORINE DU PONT HOMSEY
ELI S. JACOBS
FREDERICK D. NICHOLS
KEVIN ROCHE
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

20 December 1978

AM
10:00 *CONVENE, 708 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C.*

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Minutes of November 1978 meeting.

B. Dates of next meetings

1. 23 January 1979
27 February 1979

2. 1979 Schedule

C. PADC Board selection of development team for Willard Hotel site, report.

D. Rosslyn Skyline Status Report.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. National Academy of Science, Einstein Sculpture, National Academy of Science Building, Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

B. Smithsonian Institution - Museum of Natural History - Revisions to North and South Portals.

C. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

1. Design of High-Mast Cut-Off Lighting Standard.

2. Pedestrian Crosswalk of Avenue Intersection Designs.

D. *Department of State, Chancery of Yemen, International Center, Reno and Van Ness, N.W., Preliminary design of new building.*

E. *General Services Administration, Region III, Renovation of Liberty Loan Building, between 14th and 15th Streets at "D" Street, S.W.*

F. *District of Columbia*
Department of Economic Development

1. *Old Georgetown Act*

a. *O.G. 79-34, 1023 31st Street, N.W. New construction, mixed-use building, Theodore Manousakis, resubmission.*

b. *O.G. 79-35, 1050 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W. New construction, mixed-use complex, Premier Charter Corporation, resubmission.*

c. *O.G. 79-36, Georgetown University, New academic building with solar electric collectors.*

d. *O.G. 79-37, 3000 M Street, N.W. Hotel building, Gus Levathes, Resubmission of south elevation revisions.*

e. *Appendix 1.*

2. *Shipstead-Luce Act*

a. *S.L. 79-6, 200 South Carolina, S.E. Capitol Hill Day School, Inc. Renovation of School Building*

b. *Appendix 2.*

G. *District of Columbia*
Department of Housing and Community Development

Historic Subdivision Act

a. *Appendix 3.*

H. *U.S. Department of Labor*
Service Award Medal

b. Appendix 2, approved.

G. District of Columbia, Department of Housing and Community Development

Historic Subdivision Act

a. Appendix 3, approved.

H. U. S. Department of Labor, Service Award Medal

The Assistant introduced Mr. George Sheaffer of the U.S. Mint, who informed the members that this medal will be given to employees who have performed some kind of heroic service. The official seal of the Department will be on the obverse; the design proposed for the reverse showed a laurel wreath and a scroll with space for the recipient's name and the date. There was no objection to the basic idea, but the Chairman thought the scroll rather large and suggested using just a field instead. Mr. Sheaffer agreed to bring in a new design, based on this suggestion, to the staff for final approval.

F. B. I., J. Edgar Hoover Building, courtyard sculpture

This was an informal submission of the free standing sculptural group of three figures by Frederick Shrady, Jr. The standing figure is approximately 7 feet tall. The Chairman and the other members were concerned that this group will appear very weak placed in the large courtyard of the monumental F.B.I. building. The Chairman thought that the Commission should inspect the model, and the Secretary said he would contact representatives of the organization about this.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

December 20, 1978

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
OG 79-13	1220-22 31st Street, N.W. RSSN Associates, Ltd. Partnership	Raze shed building.

ACTION: Do not issue permit. Recommend preservation of existing shed, reconstructing existing south bearing wall or constructing new wall on north face of property line. Recommend owner take whatever steps necessary to stabilize existing shed and prevent further deterioration of structure.

17	Rear 1220-22 31st Street, N.W. RSSN Associates, Ltd. Partnership	Remove masonry retaining wall.

ACTION: Do not issue permit. Recommend refiling application for construction of new retaining wall, with south face of retaining wall to be on property line. No objection to razing existing retaining wall provided there be no disturbance or changes to garden areas beyond what is necessary to construct new wall (Max. 4' north of p.l.) Portions of new wall subject to view from public space should be finished with stone, and applicant is urged to reuse material from existing wall as much as practicable.

18 & 30	1232 Rear 31st Street, N.W. RSSN Associates, Ltd. Partnership	Raze existing building, alley building. Raze existing building, Reed House

ACTION: Do not issue permit. Recommend retention of existing building as part of unique Hamilton Arms complex. Also recommend steps be taken to preserve structures, preventing further structural deterioration, with a view towards keeping visual character of area reasonably intact.

20	3212 M Street, N.W. (rear) District of Columbia	Raze outbuilding.

ACTION: Issue permit for razing outbuilding only. Commission strongly recommends an immediate stabilization of the main building on this site which has unique architectural and historical importance to the city and the historic district as evidence by its recording in the Historic American Building Survey, its listing on the D.C. Landmarks List and placement on the National Register.

23	2750 Q Street, N.W. Dr. & Mrs. Jesse Rubin	New wing to garage residence complex.

ACTION: Issue permit. Erect site brick sample for approval by the Commission of Fine Arts prior to construction.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

December 20, 1978

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
OG 79-24	1023 31st Street, N.W. Theodore Manousakis	New construction, raze existing building.

ACTION: Do not issue permit for new construction. Issue permit for razing existing building on site. Recommend restudy of building design in a less vertical theme closer to earlier designs presented to the Commission but responsive to requests stated in action OG 79-6.

25	3222 M Street, N.W. Georgetown Park Venture	Construct 3 level enclosed shopping mall, townhouse and apt. condominium residences and accessory parking, while basically preserving existing streetscape.

ACTION: Issue permit for new construction. Submit additional details and material samples for review by the Commission at next meeting, December 20 if possible. but no later than January 20, 1979. Details shall include restudy of second floor windows on western most M Street building, diminishing size of penthouse-mechanical structure; and specific facades and alignment of townhouse elements. Material samples shall be erected for approval on site and maintained throughout construction.

26	901 34th Street, N.W. Donohoe Company	Apartment building and townhouse.

ACTION: Do not issue permit until working drawings have been approved by Commission. Approved for design development, submit preliminary designs as ready.

28	3200 Grace Street, N.W. La Maison du Steak, Inc.	Alter existing building for commercial space add two new residential floors.

ACTION: Issue permit. Submit brick samples for approval of Commission with on-site panels to be maintained throughout construction. Submit garage door design, signs, etc. as ready.

32	3307 M Street, N.W. Pier I Imports	New sign.

ACTION: Do not issue permit. No objection to reusing existing supporting frame. Translucent faced, internally illuminated sign not recommended in historic district. Recommend opaque faced letters.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

December 20, 1978

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
OG 79-33	3256 Q Street, N.W. 1006 Partners.	Wood fence.

ACTION: Issue permit for fence if it can be stained grey or a neutral color to blend with adjacent houses.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT

December 20, 1978

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
SL 78-83	1414 22nd Street, N.W. Donohce Construction Co.	Remove existing roof at grade level and reconstruct exact same size roof.

ACTION: Withdrawn

SL 79-4	2130 Cathedral Avenue, N.W. Mary Jean Callahan	New residence.

ACTION: Do not issue permit. No objection to general scheme, but request additional design drawings indicating new house conforms more closely to the adjacent townhouses. Recommend that sash in livingroom be larger than those above. Recommend a cornice treatment consistent with vicinity. Submit brick sample. The Commission strongly recommends against any new curb cut from Cathedral Avenue and approves site plan showing access to this dwelling from existing, adjacent public drive. Recommend that landscaping in front of house be treated as a natural continuation of Rock Creek Park as possible.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON HISTORIC SUBDIVISION ACT

NO.	*ADDRESS AND OWNER*	*PROJECT*
H.S. 117	*34th and Water Streets, N.W.* *Arthur Cox* *ACTION: No objection.*	*Site for Commission of Fine Arts approved residential complex.*
H.S. 119	*1530 30th Street, N.W.* *John H. and Edith N. Schafer* *ACTION: No objection.*	*Site for Commission of Fine Arts approved residence addition.*

PROJECT REPRESENTATIVES
December 20, 1978

Einstein Sculpture

Mr. Schaff
Mr. Von Sweden
Mr. Engle
Mr. Handler

Smithsonian Institution

Mr. Cooper
Mr. Leckey

Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corp.

Mr. Leland Allen

Chancery of Yemen

Mr. Al-Hariri

Liberty Loan Building
General Sevices Admin.

Mr. David Condon

1023 31st Street, N.W.

Mr. Bill Roussos

1050 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W.

Mr. Koubek

Georgetown University

Mr. Dean Price
Mr. Donald Velsey
Mr. Phil Toby

3000 M Street, N.W.

Mr. Al Wheeler
Mr. Owens

200 South Carolina Ave., S.E.

Mr. Tom Simmons

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
December 20, 1979

The meeting convened at 10:10 a.m. in the Commission of Fine Arts offices at 708 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Members Present:	*Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman* *Hon. Philip W. Buchen* *Hon. Victorine du Pont Homsey* *Hon. Eli S. Jacobs* *Hon. Frederick D. Nichols* *Hon. Kevin Roche* *Hon. Edward D. Stone, Jr.*
Staff Present:	*Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary* *Mr. Donald B. Myer, Assistant Secretary* *Mrs. Sue A. Kohler* *Mr. Jeffrey R. Carson* *Mrs. Elizabeth Bemis* *Miss Barbara Tatge*
Georgetown Board Member Present	*Mr. David Condon*
NCPC Staff Present:	*Mr. Robert Gresham*
House District Committee Staff Present:	*Mr. Nelson Rimensnider*

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Minutes of November 1978 meeting, approved.

B. Dates of next meetings, approved as: 31 January, 1979
21 February, 1979

C. PADC Board selections of development team from Willard Hotel site, report: The Secretary reported that the Stuart Golding-Fairmont Hotel group had been the Board's choice. Their architects are Hardy, Holzman, Pfeiffer of New York.

D. Rosslyn Skyline status report: The Secretary informed the members that he plans to attend a meeting on the 21st of December with the Justice and Interior Department lawyers concerning the suit the Government is bringing against the Arlington County Board and the private developers. Mr. Buchen asked to see a copy of the complaint when available in order to determine whether the Commission should file a brief.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. National Academy of Sciences, Einstein sculpture, National Academy of Sciences Building, Constitution Avenue, N.W. The Assistant Secretary informed the members that this submission was for a landscaping plan. He noted also that Mrs. Berks, the wife of the sculptor, was present to answer any questions the members might have regarding the sculpture. Mr. Von Sweden, the landscape architect, was introduced and explained that the statue would be set in a grove of large trees with small shrubs and various kinds of ground cover planted in adjacent spaces. To the right, as one approaches the building, would be a landscaped sitting area. The members approved the idea of a sitting area and the use of large trees around the statue, but felt that too many kinds of plant material were being proposed and that the effect would be too fussy and residential for such a large sculpture. Mr. Engle, the lighting engineer, discussed his plans and said that the overall effect should be subtle, that only a glow of light should be seen through the trees. Lights with diffusing lenses would be set in the steps and small lights would be used within the area to define edges. The members approved the idea of subtle lighting but questioned some of the methods of achieving it; Mr. Engle replied that various approaches would be tried before making a final decision.

Mrs. Berks was introduced and was questioned by the members regarding the color, texture and size of the sculpture. There was some apprehension that the extreme roughness of the texture might not be appropriate for a very large sculpture. In response to a question, a representative of the National Academy of Sciences said the figure would be 12 feet tall. As the model the members had seen previously was very small and somewhat misleading, the Chairman asked Mrs. Berks if the Commission might see a full scale model at the sculptor's studio. She replied that the waxes could be seen in February, but that these, of course, would be fragmented. The Chairman remarked that the inspection of a full scale model is a traditional and very important function of the Commission and that this should be carried out before final approval is granted.

EXHIBIT A

B. Smithsonian Institution, Museum of Natural History, revisions to north and south portals. The Assistant Secretary introduced Mr. Reiss from the Smithsonian who explained that the modifications to the north entrance would be primarily to accomodate the handicapped, and at the south, changes would be proposed for safety reasons as well. At the north, the heavy bronze doors would be rehung with new hinges which would facilitate opening but would not affect appearance. The major change would be the construction of a ramp up to the entrance; this would also require the addition of several new steps. After looking at the drawings, the Chairman suggested that there be symmetrical entrances to the right and left rather than as shown, and Mr. Roche thought that the ramp should be made of granite or whatever material is there at present to avoid a temporary look.

The changes to the south entrance from the Mall, which is the most used by visitors, would involve the addition of two new doors, one on each side of the present entrance. These would be blanked out

on the outside and used strictly for emergency egress, a safety problem now because of the inadequate width of the existing doors. The members did not see any reason for concealment, and thought that two ordinary doors should be installed, their use not limited to emergency purposes. The other changes proposed were railings and planters to keep people from falling or jumping off the stairs. While it was conceded that these were probably necessary, the Secretary said that he was concerned with the placement of the railing and Mr. Stone questioned the appearance of the planters. The Chairman thought that a model or elevation drawings should be seen and suggested that Mr. Reiss bring this material to the staff for discussion and approval. *EXHIBIT B*

C. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation, design of high-mast, cut-off lighting standard. Mr. Leland Allen of the PADC staff was introduced and said that this submission was in reality a progress report on the design of both the high-mast and decorative light fixtures to be used on the avenue. He introduced the lighting engineer, Mr. Roy Grinwald, who first described the proposed high-mast standard. He said it would be a very simple fixture, curved at the top to project over the street, the light covered with a dome-like shield. He showed drawings of this shield and explained that its design was not yet final. The height of the standard would be 40 feet, and it would be painted a rich, matte grey. He said these fixtures would be barely noticeable along the avenue as they would be set on the south side of the street only, and because of an underground water line would be set back 14 feet from the curb, necessitating a longer arm than elsewhere. The light source will be blue-white in color so as not to compete with the warm incandescent light on the Capitol. He said the illumination level would be 3 times what it is at present, a level which he thought too high. The Commission emphatically agreed, urging that it be cut drastically to save energy and reduce glare.

Mr. Grinwald turned to the decorative fixture next, reporting that a decision had been made to stay with the traditional single globe Washington street light. The globe would be clear, and as the 40 watt mercury vapor light bulb is not attractive, a refractor would be added to shield it and also add the "glitter" associated with incandescent lighting. There would be some redesign of the base and the cap. The Chairman said he did not like the idea of using a clear glass modern globe on a traditional street light. Mr. Grinwald agreed and thought that a raindrop glass or something similar would be better. He then turned to the problem of the meandering line of lights caused by the grade changes along the avenue, and said that to overcome this, changes would be made in the pole heights as necessary. No approval was required for this submission, and it was expected that the Commission would be kept informed as further refinements and developments take place.

Note: The design of the pedestrian crosswalks, listed on the agenda, was not discussed at this meeting.

D. Department of State; Chancery of Yemen, International Center, Reno Road and Van Ness Street, N.W., preliminary design of new buildings. The Assistant Secretary said that this project had been submitted by the

State Department for the Commission's comments, and that it would be reviewed by the Planning Commission for conformance to master plan, parking, and screening requirements. He introduced the architect, Mr. Al-Hariri, who explained that buildings in Yemen possess a distinct architectural style characterized by the use of stone and multi-story design, even in small villages. He hopes to use this style in the chancery, adapting it to modern functions and the location in a different climate. It will be a small building, housing only 15-18 people. The official, formal entrance will be into the main level; the buildings multi-story aspect will be expressed most clearly on the rear, or Reno Road, elevation, where the grade drops steeply. The materials are expected to be a light sandstone and a darker granite.

Mr. Stone, who did the original planning for the area, expressed concern that it was taking on the character of a subdivision because of the surface parking surrounding each building and the great variety contemplated in the architecture. Mr. Gresham from the Planning Commission said that there are controls over lot coverage and parking, but no other controls behind lot lines. Mr Hariri noted that the government of Yemen had cut down the amount of parking originally planned. Mr. Stone thought the Commission should see the plan now governing the area before other submissions come before it. There was no objection to the design of the chancery building itself. EXHIBIT C

E. General Services Administration, Region III; Renovation of Liberty Loan Building, between 14th and 15th Streets and D Street, S.W. The Assistant Secretary introduced staff member Jeffrey Carson who described the building under consideration as a reinforced concrete structure built during World War I. Originally 3 stories, it was increased to 5 in 1972; in 1952 access to 14th Street was cut through the building. The present proposal by GSA is primarily for interior remodeling, for continued use by the Treasury Department (Bureau of Engraving and Printing). New doors would also be installed on the 14th Street side with a curb cut and drop-off station for the handicapped. Mr. Carson said that the Planning Commission had reacted unfavorably to this request and recommended, as they have previously, that the building be demolished and the site returned to parkland. He introduced Mr. Pedro Porro from GSA who said that his agency's position is that this is still a solid building, a valuable piece of property needed by the Treasury, and should be upgraded and used. Mr Gresham, representing NCPC, said that the building has no particular merit, and the site has for many years, been designated for park purposes. Mr. Nelson Rimensnider, of the House District Committee staff, said that his committee is not especially anxious to preserve it.

Mr. David Condon, whose firm has been hired by GSA to do the remodeling, said that while this phase of the work will be mostly air conditioning, future plans include the replacement of the deteriorating wood double-hung sash with metal casements and the reconditioning of the exterior stucco.

The Chairman said that he did not particularly object to this building; it defines the edge of the city, is well-screened by planting, and will balance the site to the east, which is to be built up. The other members agreed with him. While reluctant to oppose the Planning

Commission's recommendations, he said he could see no reason to demolish a building which is acceptable esthetically, gives the Treasury needed space within the city, and does not deprive the area of needed green space.

EXHIBIT D

F. District of Columbia, Department of Economic Development

1. Old Georgetown Act

a. O.G. 79-34, 1023 31st Street, N.W., New construction, mixed-use building, Theodore Manousakis, resubmission. The Assistant Secretary reviewed the two previous designs for this project, the second of which had a vertical emphasis the Commission did not like. The architect, Bill Roussos, discussed his new design, a revision of the first. He said that he had reduced the actual height and tried to cut the apparent height by setbacks and a breaking up of the skyline on the north face, where the full height would be very noticeable from the canal. He pointed out also that the windows had been reduced in size and that an iron railing now carries on the cornice line of the adjacent townhouses. However, it was clear from the drawings shown that the building would be much larger that the Commission had been led to suspect by the previous submissions, which did not show the tall and bulky "superstructure" behind the facade. The members were also unhappy with the north corner as it would relate to the townhouses. Mr. Roche criticized the use of too many architectural elements, most of which are not characteristic of Georgetown. He said that what is needed here is simple, background architecture.

Mr. Condon, representing the Georgetown Board, said that the board still preferred the first version, but was happy to see some of the mass broken up in this design. He felt, however, that the building is still an imposition on the small townhouses and should really not be more than four stories high.

The general feeling was that the building is grossly overscaled for the site. It was suggested that a smaller, one-use structure (possibly all offices) might be acceptable. The project was not approved.

b. O.G. 79-35, 1050 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W.; New Construction, mixed-use complex, Premier Charter Corporation, resubmission. The Assistant Secretary noted that there was no one at the meeting representing this project, but showed the members new drawings with changes in the apartment building which have not yet been seen by the Georgetown Board. Mr. Condon remarked that this building has the same problems seen in the project just discussed; too much bulk and too many architectural elements. It was agreed by all that the project needed further study. No action was requested.

c. O.G. 79-36, Georgetown University; New academic building with solar electric collectors. The Assistant Secretary introduced Mr. Dean Price from Georgetown University who explained that this building, to be located in the center of the campus, will be used as an international cultural affairs center and will contain a number of small offices as well as classrooms for the foreign service,

language, and other related departments. He said that, additionally, it will have a scientific function, that of acting as a solar producer of electricity, providing an auxiliary system to the university's power grid. The roofs will be utilized to perform this function and will be covered with solar shingles.

Mr. Donald Velsey, from the office of William Metcalf and Associates, architects, discussed the design. He noted that the site is at a crucial axis on the campus, between the Quadrangle and the new dormitories, and that the ground slopes sharply to the west. As designed, the building is arranged around a central galleria four stories high, in order to provide light, facilitate circulation and give the faculty the visual contact with each other that had been requested. There will be an intimate, collegiate courtyard space in front of the building where students can gather, and also an outdoor amphitheater.

Mr. Velsey then discussed the role the scientific function played in the development of the design. Large roof areas and an orientation to catch the maximum amount of sun were of primary importance. He said there had been a effort not to overstress the technological aspect in the appearance, recognizing that this building must be compatible with others on the campus. The dark grey solar shingles, hexagonal in shape, will be in keeping with Healy Hall and the mansards of other older buildings. The long (400 feet) cantilevered roof to the north, and the steeply sloping south roof, broken up with openings, are dominant elements in the design. The Chairman was uncertain about these long roof expanses and how they would relate to other campus buildings, as well as the effect of the building when viewed from the George Washington Memorial Parkway. Mr. Condon reported that the Georgetown Board had found the concept exciting but was concerned about the actual quality of the roof surface and how it would be matched on the soffits and fascias. The Board, as well as the members of the Commission, stressed that the solar shingles must not be reflective. The design was given preliminary approval, with the expectation that it would be seen again.

d. O.G. 79-37, 3000 M Street, N.W.; Hotel building, Gus Levathes, resubmission of south elevation revisions. The Assistant Secretary showed the members drawings of the revised elevation with a more regular grouping of windows. There were no objections to the window grouping, although Mr. Nichols asked that the architect move the belt course to the sill of the top windows, in order to give the building a more substantial appearance. This he agreed to do, and the project was given final approval.

e. Appendix 1, approved.

2. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 79-6, 200 South Carolina Ave., S.E.; Capitol Hill Day School, Inc., renovation of school building. The Assistant Secretary showed drawings of the proposed changes, which include new doors and the addition of a skylight. The doorway itself will not be changed in appearance. The renovations were approved.

b. Appendix 2, approved.

G. District of Columbia, Department of Housing and Community Development

Historic Subdivision Act

a. Appendix 3, approved.

H. U. S. Department of Labor, Service Award Medal

The Assistant Secretary introduced Mr. George Schafer of the U.S. Mint, who informed the members that this medal will be given to employees who have performed some kind of heroic service. The official seal of the Department will be on the obverse; the design proposed for the reverse showed a laurel wreath and a scroll with space for the recipient's name and the date. There was no objection to the basic idea, but the Chairman thought the scroll rather large and suggested using just a field instead. Mr. Schafer agreed to bring in a new design, based on this suggestion, to the staff for final approval.

EXHIBIT E

F. B. I., J. Edgar Hoover Building, courtyard sculpture

This was an informal submission of the free standing sculptural group of three figures by Frederick Shrady, Jr. The standing figure is approximately 7 feet tall. The Chairman and the other members were concerned that this group will appear very weak placed in the large courtyard of the monumental F.B.I. building. The Chairman thought that the Commission should inspect the model, and the Secretary said he would contact representatives of the organization about this.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

Signed,

Charles H. Atherton

Charles H. Atherton, Secretary

EXHIBIT A

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman
NICOLAS ARROYO
JANE O. DART
KEVIN ROCHE
CHLOETHIEL WOODARD SMITH
EDWARD STONE, JR.
GEORGE WEYMOUTH
CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-343-9324

Dear Dr. Handler:

The Commission of Fine Arts reviewed landscape plans for the Einstein sculpture at the National Academy of Sciences grounds during its December meeting. The Commission is glad to see the treatment of the landscape, but asked your representatives during our meeting for additional study simplifying the number of plant materials and the massing of proposed materials. We feel that the studies have been constructive in treating the south grounds in a unified manner. However, the use of large numbers of flowers in the main walk and the complicated shapes of some of the proposed new walks should be further studied. The plant material should consist of ground covers and evergreens that are consistent with frontage on Constitution Avenue and should not include clumps of tall grass and wild flowers such as were used on the new building for the Federal Reserve.

The sculpture itself was discussed with Mrs. Berks during our meeting. Our hope that the Commission would have more opportunity to review the progressive stages of the sculpture with regard to exact size and finish and to assess the enlargement of the small scale models was frustrated by the speed with which the project has progressed. With any major sculpture the Commission normally will examine a work at full size prior to casting.

It is our understanding that the molds are in the process of fabrication at a Long Island facility. We would like an opportunity to examine the work before final casting of the sections in bronze. Since these molds are a negative form, it would be most helpful to have a plaster impression made of at least one typical segment, such as the head, so we can examine the detailed features of the sculpture.

Please let us know what the sculptor's schedule is so we can make arrangements for an inspection.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Dr. Philip Handler
President
National Academy of Sciences
2101 Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20418

EXHIBIT B

202-566-1066

January 17, 1979

Dear Mr. Reiss:

This confirms the Commission of Fine Arts discussion with you about revisions to the north and south portals of the Museum of Natural History. The Commission fully endorses the concept of providing access to the handicapped at the north entrance and additional egress to the south portals. We do feel that seeing additional details on the specific designs and the proposed materials would be in everyone's interest, and hope that we can see the project in more detail in the future.

On the north portal the Commission feels strongly that a fully symmetrical arrangement would be desirable. The proposed ramps flanking the entrance ought to be detailed with an appropriate type of curbing to look as much as possible like an original part of the design. The Commission feels that the new entrances on the south side of the building ought to look like original entrances as much as possible and be treated in a manner that is uniform with the existing center entrance. How the actual materials and detailing of the doors themselves are treated is our primary concern. The Commission and its staff look forward to working with you and the consultants and we will be happy to discuss the matter further at either our January 31st or February 21st meeting.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Phillip K. Reiss
Director
Architecture and Engineering
Smithsonian Institution
Washington, D.C. 20560

EXHIBIT C

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman
PHILIP W. BUCHEN — FREDERICK D. NICHOLS
VICTORINE DU PONT HOMSEY — KEVIN ROCHE
ELI S. JACOBS — EDWARD D. STONE, JR.
CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

January 11, 1979

Dear Mr. Gookin:

The Commission of Fine Arts was happy to approve preliminary designs for the Chancery of Yemen to be located at the International Center, Reno Road and Van Ness Street, North West. We stand ready to review working drawings, material samples, and landscape plans as they are developed. Our understanding is that the amount of paving and parking is in the process of being reduced in conjunction with the National Capital Planning Commission. This we would encourage since one of our overriding concerns is adequate landscape being retained on the slopes between the Chancery and the adjacent public streets as well as landscape screening between the chanceries.

As we have reviewed the last few Chancery proposals we are increasingly aware of a potential problem of not allowing enough landscape screen between the sites and feel it would be desirable to discuss this matter further with representatives of the Department of State. Perhaps this could take place at one of the Commission's regular meetings as an update review of the overall master plan for this important area. The Commission's next meetings will be on January 31st and February 21, 1979. Our staff will be available to discuss the possible framework for such a discussion with your staff at your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Richard Gookin
Assistant Chief of Protocol
Department of State
United States of America
Washington, D.C. 20520

EXHIBIT D

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman
PHILIP W. BUCHEN — FREDERICK D. NICHOLS
VICTORINE DU PONT HOMSEY — KEVIN ROCHE
ELI S. JACOBS — EDWARD D. STONE, JR.
CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

January 11, 1979

Dear Mr. Stuart:

The Commission of Fine Arts reviewed and approved efforts at upgrading the safety and appearance of the Liberty Loan Building on 14th Street during its December 20, 1978 meeting. In approving the upgrading of this structure we feel we are serving the immediate public interest in view of the building's present dilapidated state. Those efforts along with some additional landscape may be an asset to the city's entrance. We are well aware that long-range plans have recommended eventual removal of this building and return of the land to park use. The Commission feels this may well be a desirable objective but understands present time and space demands and feels a spirit of cooperation is well in order.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. J. B. Stuart
Director
Construction Management Division
General Services Administration
Region III
Washington, D.C. 20407

EXHIBIT E

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

January 9, 1979

Dear Mr. Schaeffer:

This confirms the Commission of Fine Arts discussion on the U.S. Department of Labor Service Award Medal during our meeting with you on December 20, 1978. The Commission recommended some simplification, eliminating the scroll and enlarging the potential inscription area. The suggestion was made to replace the rope motif with a laurel leaf motif to achieve a much simpler, more dignified design. With your assurance that this type of scheme can be satisfactorily worked out, our hope is that you can coordinate revision with Mr. Atherton who will act in our behalf.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. George Schaeffer
Bureau of the Mint
U.S. Treasury
Washington, D.C. 20220

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman
PHILIP W. BUCHEN
VICTORINE DU PONT HOMSEY
ELI S. JACOBS
FREDERICK D. NICHOLS
KEVIN ROCHE
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.
CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

January 15, 1979

Dear Mr. Poor:

I appreciate your sending along a copy of Courts Oulahan's Memorandum on the proposed D.C. Zoning Changes. It is helpful for us to know the Citizens Association point of view and to read support for the dangers of "overzoning" and height limitation revision upward. Though the Zoning Commission does not solicit the Commission of Fine Arts views on proposed changes, we deal with the various aspects on a case-by-case basis during project review. We are aware that the National Capital Planning Commission has voted in favor of the proposed changes, but read no specific signs from the incoming city administration on the subject.

You can be assured that we will continue to follow the matter closely and will be appreciative of having access to your views.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Charles L. Poor
President
The Citizens Association of Georgetown
2803 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007